

**EAST STROUDSBURG AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF EDUCATION
POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
MAY 20, 2024
CARL T. SECOR ADMINISTRATION CENTER & VIA ZOOM—4:30 P.M.
MINUTES**

- I. Meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m. by Keith Karkut.
- II. **Policy Committee Members Present were:** George Andrews, Jason Gullstrand, Keith Karkut, and Debbie Kulick (arrived 4:36).
- III. **School Personnel Present were:** Peter Bard, Eric Forsyth, Debra Wisotsky, and Steve Zall
- IV. **Members of the Board Present were:** Wayne Rohner.
- V. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE: Motion was made by George Andrews to approve this agenda for May 20, 2024 (page 1), with members of the Committee reserving the right to add to the agenda and take further action as the Committee deems appropriate. Motion was seconded by Debbie Kulick and carried unanimously, 4-0.

Mr. Karkut apologized to the public for the late start to the meeting.

VI. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE: Motion was made by Debbie Kulick to approve the minutes for by April 15, 2024 (pages 1-7). Motion was seconded by Jason Gullstrand and carried unanimously 4-0.

Mr. Karkut thanked Ms. Wisotsky for the detailed minutes to the meeting.

VII. **POLICIES FOR DISCUSSION:**

Policies presented by administration-

- Policy 006 Meeting—Mr. Karkut stated, from what I can gather, this is PSBA's template. Is that what we based this on, the template? Mr. Forsyth responded, it is, and the actual template is copied behind this policy for you. Mr. Karkut stated the only thing we've done other than the different supporting documentation. On page 10 of 13 under Section 15 after, "Notations and any tape or audiovisual recordings shall not be the official record of the public board meeting." We added, "Any notations and or audiovisual recordings of a Board meeting shall be retained for one year from the date of the meeting and disposed of in accordance with the district's records retention schedule." Mr. Karkut asked about the word notations? Does anyone know what notations refers to? Ms. Wisotsky replied it is the written notes that I take at the meeting. He said, so your stenographer's report is held along with the recordings and anything else until it is Board approved and then you destroy them. Mr. Forsyth replied just so you don't think we pulled that phrase out of thin air, is the way that it was originally captured by PSBA, and it was long in policy. I just took a look for myself to confirm that. And it's also listed there as it was previously.

Mr. Andrews asked do we need to have a whole new policy, referring to the new draft Policy 006.2, or could it just be added to Policy 006 after notations. Ms. Kulick noted that Policy 006.2 talks specifically about live streaming of meetings and it is separate and easier to refer to. Mr. Karkut asked since we have a policy about meetings, why do we need a separate policy? Mr. Forsyth said first, we could start by indicating that this is not a PSBA recommended policy. This is a policy that some other districts have adopted because of the widespread use of streaming, especially since the pandemic because streaming is such a separate subject in and of itself. There are other requirements that may go with that, as you'll see in the policy for postings that may be required of the district or recommended. We're bringing it to you under a separate piece because this in and of itself could be turned on or off by the Board, totally separate from their policy on meetings. The language that you see in the policy on meetings that we were just discussing as to whether to include or not, when you look back it has always been there because it simply indicates that when you make some kind of recording for yourself, it's going to be made available for a certain period of time or destroyed. This policy is simply giving you the opportunity to decide if you wish to capture what the district has been doing since we entered the pandemic and is continuing to do. Are we going to continue making live streaming versions of our meetings available because we don't have any policy requirement presently to do so. Mr. Andrews inquired if we asked PSBA. Mr. Forsyth said they are not recommending one at this point in time. They are not because there's no legal requirement to; but if we do it, there's some recommendations as to what we might post, so that individuals who are coming to these meetings understand that they are being live streamed and whatever they say will be captured out there for the public to view for a year should they decide to participate. So that's really the gist of this policy. We simply brought it to you as something to know it's out there and you can decide to do with it as you please. There's no requirement to include it. Ms. Kulick stated I think it's an important point for us to make, so that people know that they're publicly being recorded. Mr. Karkut noted we do make them aware and in all our publications, that it will be in person and also live streamed. Ms. Kulick added and now you have something that's a policy to point to. It also details that audio visual recordings of executive sessions etc., when discussing personnel litigation and negotiations, are not to be live streamed. Mr. Forsyth stated, I would imagine, and this is just my speculation, the districts that started using this policy may have had to make clear to their participants that they were giving consent to be put out there on the stream and that there's no expectation to privacy when they're in a Zoom Meeting, because the Zoom is also part of that live stream when it gets published. Mr. Karkut said I think we make that clear when they register on Zoom meeting that they are being broadcast and a simple sign on our door, saying, if you enter this room a recording is in progress. Mr. Forsyth added, which we don't have. Mr. Karkut said I don't necessarily think we need a whole policy on it. I mean, we can add a Section 20 on meetings. Ms. Kulick stated I think that if you've got something and it ferrets out all the information you don't have to say, look at policy, go down to number 20, you just say, go to this policy. Here it is, and this is this is the criteria, and these are the parameters, and this is how it's used.

Mr. Gullstrand shared, if I'm reading something in a text and then this is the blown-up portion of that section that says, here's where it is, I think it makes it easier for us to refer to and say this section here. The one thing I just had a question for Eric was when we post the public meetings will be broadcast at the time of public meeting and via Zoom and YouTube, do we want to specifically allocate those two particular resources? Or should we also mentioned if in the future we utilize another platform, "including but not limited to". Mr. Forsyth stated, we could generalize the language, but also because it's sort of compact on its own here, we could bring it back to grant the Board's permission to switch platforms as well if it's specified in policy. So again, it's the Board's decision. Mr. Gullstrand said I think that would make sense because the

meeting policy in and of itself is long. And I think this is just that blown up portion which you can get more detailed regarding that. I just would never want to see us say, God forbid Zoom isn't working, and we must use Google Meet or Microsoft, or something like that. Mr. Karkut stated the big purpose of why we're using Zoom presently, is during the pandemic that was the only way of getting multiple people on that could speak at the same time; however, the streaming technology in our nation has gotten so much better.

Mr. Karkut shared the one thing that concerned him about this policy is the sentence, “The district does not necessarily endorse or support the views, opinion, standards, or information contained in the live stream/recording of the public meetings”. Did we run the wording through our solicitor? Basically, if a board member or administrator states something at the meeting, it's not really endorsed as a part of that meeting? Mr. Forsyth replied, correct. Mr. Karkut said but it is part of the meeting. It's in the minutes. Mr. Forsyth shared but it may not be the collective Boards' opinion. I might state something here this evening. You could totally disagree with it. You wouldn't want that to be construed by anyone to be the district's position. Our point in bringing this to you this evening was to get it in front of you to see if you're interested. If you are, then we can go back and before posting we can make sure that our solicitor reviews it, as he does all policies, and we can bring it back to you next month for the final read. Mr. Karkut stated, I'm okay after listening to Jason's opinion and Debbie. I'm okay with having several policies. I'm just concerned with some of the language in it, it just seems a little harsh. If our solicitor says that's enough to make it happen, then I'm okay with that. Any other questions. Mr. Gullstrand added, I just want to make sure that we do say it's live, and it's recorded. And I understand Keith's concern about somebody coming in and speaking in front and not knowing that they're being recorded. We should have something on the door. Both Mr. Gullstrand and Ms. Kulick shared they like the policies being separate as it is a shorter portion of the policy, and they can just go right to that section. The committee collectively agreed to keep Policies 006 and 006.2 separate.

- Policy 202 Attendance Eligibility—Mr. Karkut shared the only edit to the policy is on page four. Mr. Forsyth stated you just saw this policy in February and that was for the purpose of including language due to some statute changes, particularly with how we handle families with children of military families, etc. and what we were doing in our annual review of our enrollment process with our child accounting department. We were noting whether or not we were still accepting forms that were in line with what the policy was seeking for residency due to some changes in what we now see on certain policies and forms regarding children who are here because they're dependents of a parent or an individual who's not their parent. This is for someone registering children who are not their own. In the district, we wanted to make sure the policy language accurately reflects the types of documents that we're seeing. They're minor edits to the language in this section to ensure that what we are asking for and what we're receiving does indeed satisfy the requirements of the policy. In some cases, we may have been accepting information from the State on a form that didn't include a statement that the child was a dependent of the resident. Well, that's because those forms don't really say that. Instead, we will receive a copy of a state form, notifying the resident that the child who is with them is eligible for benefits at their address, which is sufficient for us to satisfy policy. The way it was previously worded we had to read a lot into it. This is simply an effort to make the policy accurately reflect what the district is doing to accommodate those enrollments. Mr. Karkut asked, what I gather you're saying as an example would be if a child has parents that are divorced. One parent lives in Stroudsburg one parent lives in East Stroudsburg. We want verification that the parent that lives in East Stroudsburg's residential address that's the residency of that child. Is that what we're looking to gather? Mr. Forsyth replied, no, in that case, the parent who's here, it's still a child who's their own, so we don't need to know anything more than this is the parent of the child registering the student who's

our resident. I'll give you an example. We have maybe a family that lives out of state. For whatever reason the parent or parents aren't currently caring for their own child, that child may be living here with another person to whom they're related or they're not. To ensure that we're complying with the spirit of the school code, which says one should be caring for the child as if they are their own without any payment, they're doing that gratis. We've required these documents to substantiate that. What we're determining is we don't have a family who might be residing outside of the district but in essence school shopping to send someone here because they found someone who would let the child sleep here and yet the parent is really providing everything, health insurance, everything they have for the child from back home with their other siblings. These are the pieces of information the district has gathered. We made this change, probably going back over twenty years now and when we did that, we were one of several school districts in our county that were accommodating a number of bedroom community children that didn't really reside here. Their families resided in New York or New Jersey. When we enacted these changes, we had over 300 students that had to leave the district and go back to their resident schools that really had no basis for being here because we didn't have any documentation requirement. It's more for those limited circumstances that we have but we just want to make sure that when we're accepting them, that the document we are taking from them is one that is really spoken to in the policy. Where we ran into the difficulties most recently, we're in the benefits notification letters. They're bringing them to us, but they didn't say what the policy previously said they should, because things have changed over the years. We're looking at the benefit notifications that we receive now that say, Eric lives with so and so at this address and is eligible for benefits. They've already vetted the need and everything else through the State as a third party. We don't get involved. We just accept that as a substantiating document to the person's sworn statement. They're making a sworn statement indicating that they're supporting the child gratis. We're just attaching this to the back. Mr. Andrews asked could a grandparent be that example. Mr. Forsyth replied, it would be an excellent example. Mr. Andrews asked but the parent would be taking care of the insurance, but the grandparent would be advocate here all the time. Mr. Forsyth said the grandparent would be having the child live with them as if they were their own and they would be able to substantiate that by providing one of the five bulleted documents here. Mr. Karkut stated, in that case, what form would a grandparent supply that would be sufficient for this policy as presented. Mr. Forsyth said some have a Federal or State income tax form because they're claiming the child is a dependent because they've been living with them consistently. Others may have had an insurance policy that listed them. Those that were provided only with the health or the State health insurance form, it indicated that they were to be listed as a dependent of the residents for public assistance didn't work that way. We're just clarifying the language to make sure that the policy speaks to the documents that we can actually obtain. Mr. Karkut asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Gullstrand asked, just out of curiosity, how does it work for a student who like you're saying lives with a grandparent who doesn't have those, but they have educational rights of their grandchild. Mr. Forsyth replied, separately, that would be pursuant to a court order and that would be a kinship care placement which falls under a different section of the school code, which isn't addressed in these requirements. The committee had no other concerns with this policy.

- Policy 620 General Operating Fund Balance – Mr. Karkut shared this is a new draft policy. I'm just clarifying for the board that there also is another policy. That is the PSBA suggested policy for this. But we are opting to write our own policy. Mr. Bard shared this policy came about because when we went through our ESSER monitoring. It was a policy that was missing. And we got a negative mark on our monitoring. Most districts follow the PSBA model. The committee had some questions, so we went back and we rewrote the policy taking some of your comments and concerns into effect. So that's the policy you are looking at in the draft form here. I'm willing

to answer any questions. Mr. Andrews asked, didn't you tell me in executive session and in the public that Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) is part of the General Fund (GF). The CRF is not part of the GF, but it's part of the overall scope of money that's available. Mr. Andrews asked when we're talking the amount of money in our district, the CRF is included with the GF. Am I correct? Mr. Bard replied, it is but it isn't because it's not part of the General Operating Fund, because it's set aside in a different accounting form. The CRF is part of the money that's available for the district to spend on capital projects that are set aside outside of the general operating budget, but it is part of all the money that the district has available to it to spend on any given capital project. You could spend money out of the CR, or you could spend money out of the GF. So that's probably where the disconnect is there? However, when you move money out of the GF into the CRF, it limits you to what you can now use that money in the CRF for, so the policy that is in front of you is specifically for just the general operating fund, which is why we limited and why we excluded the accounts that were on the fund there so there was no confusion. Mr. Andrews stated but that's playing games with the public. You tell the public we have a GF of \$30 million but we're not including the CRF when we actually have, and I'm not saying we can use it for all GF, but we actually have a GF plus a CRF of \$50 million dollars. Mr. Bard stated CRF is actually noted in the budget and in the AFR's, so the money is declared, and it is in the audit books as well. It's moving money, saving money and allocating money to projects you're going to need. I don't believe it's playing games. I believe it's allocating money and ultimately being smart about it. Ms. Kulick noted it's what your spendable money is. Your CFR is restricted. But this talks about your operating fund. This is your active money that you can use to pay your day-to-day bills. Mr. Karkut suggested, I think the confusion here and it has been confusion for a while, is what is a fund balance. You know we have a lot of fund balances, but we've always assumed that the fund balance was the large pool of money that was reserved for certain projects. Ms. Kulick said the GF balance versus the operating fund balances. Mr. Bard said the fund balance is the money left over after you pay all your bills. For example, if you make \$50,000 a year and your bills equal \$45,000 a year on your personal level, your personal fund balance is \$5,000. The school district has the general fund balance which you'll hear in the budget presentation stands at a little over \$51 million. That's what it is right now. That's what the auditors have audited the books. That's what it sets as of July 30, 2023. Then you take that money and then the budget deficit for 2023-2024 sets it around \$8.5 million. That's what the budgeted deficit is now. The deficit is not going to come in at \$8.5 million, because we're probably spending about 4.5-5% less than what the budgeted expenditures are for this year. We'll probably come in somewhere around, like I've said publicly since April, somewhere between a \$1-\$2 million deficit and that might even be a conservative number as well. In that sense, the fund balance will then cover that as well. The difference between the fund balances is, the CRF is set solely for the purposes of capital projects. Mr. Andrews stated I understand fully but we're just not telling the public what we really have. So why don't we just go with the policy that PSBA has. Mr. Bard said we could. Mr. Karkut added what's concerning me is when Debbie just tried to explain it, she said there's a general fund and an operating fund. Those are the words your referenced. Mr. Bard suggested they just drop the word operating. Let's say the general fund balance, and that's it. And then there's capital reserve. Don't use the word fund. There's a capital reserve, and there's a fund balance which is for building projects. Mr. Andrews said I understand that's still part of the general fund even though we're not using it for that. We would just say we're using it for this other part. And then that's why we moved from the general fund during the year to the capital when we have that money, but it's still part of it, once we put it over there, I know we can't bring it back. I'm aware of that part, but it's part of the money that the public should know that we have in in the budget. Mr. Bard replied, correct, and it's always publicly stated in the AFR's and in the audit report. Mr. Andrews said it's not publicly stated in our Budget Report. The budget report just says the general fund should be \$51 million instead of \$80 million. Mr. Bard replied, George, the reason is because we can't use

that money to pay our day-to-day bills, so we can't bring the money out to pay the operating expenses, like to pay salaries. Mr. Andrews added in the future we should never put anything in the capital reserve until we are absolutely sure it has to go in the capital reserve. I understand that, but that money is still there. I understand what you said that you can't use it, but it's in the district. We have that money in the district. I don't see why we don't say when you do the budget presentation that we have the general fund of let's say \$51 million and then we have capital reserve, which is part of our money of \$24 million. Mr. Bard stated it's around 19 million. But the thing that we spend on, we do projects, so the public sees a physical plant that consists of 10 buildings, and they see vehicles, and they see other things that have to be maintained. They see the buildings being maintained; they see the money in that respect. Mr. Andrews stated they don't see it when you do your presentation, they don't see it as that, they see it as one fund. Mr. Karkut added one of the things when it comes to the budget and when we present our budget to Harrisburg every year and the community, we are not allocating student activity money into our budget because that's student money. We're not allocating scholarship money. That's scholarships. We're not paying that, we're not allocating cafeteria because that's separate. But in our budget to the State, we are allocating capital reserve fund as money that we possess. Mr. Bard stated the capital reserve money is presented as money that we have. Mr. Karkut asked if we take this and put this into this policy. Are we now saying that the CRF is separate from budget? I'm concerned that these other items listed 1, 2, 3, 4 are not used for budgeting purposes, but now we're lumping them with the capital reserve. Will that affect our budget? Mr. Bard replied no, the only thing that this policy speaks to is under Pennsylvania School Code. It's only speaking to the general fund's four classifications of what the general fund allows the school districts to put categories of their general fund balances to that they're allowed to code them to like non-spendable committed, assigned or unassigned. That's the only thing that this policy speaks to. It doesn't speak to the Capital Reserve, doesn't speak to any particular other funds, it doesn't speak to the Food Service Fund, and it doesn't speak to the capital reserve. It only speaks to the general fund, and there are four classifications of how they account for the general fund balance in that respect. How were they coded before, that was just some feedback that we received from last month. We could delete all of them from the policy. We don't have to put them in. We put them in simply because that was some feedback from the last meeting. You can take them all out. They don't need to be in there. Mr. Karkut asked, do you mean feedback from this meeting? Mr. Bard said yes, I believe there was the questions about what funds were included, and what funds were not included. The capital funds, and money that's available to do projects. But it's only available to do projects but doesn't affect the Board's ability to pay their day-to-day bills like you can take capital reserve money out to pay maintenance bills. When you put money in there, it severely restricts the ability. Mr. Andrews interrupted, stating I understand that. In your presentations to the community, if you want to say, our general fund is this, and our CRF is this, and that's a total of this so the community knows that we have 70 million dollars to spend, not all on general fund, because the capital reserve can't be taken out. At least the community has an idea of what we have. Mr. Bard stated it does, but it also might paint a false sense of security to the public. If you say you have \$18 million in capital reserve, and you have \$70 million dollars, but \$20 million is severely restricted. They might think they have \$70 million total. So, I think it gives them a false sense of security. \$51 million can be readily accessed and \$20 million of that \$70 can't. But the general public may not understand that difference. You understand it because you're sitting in that chair and you have a very, very smart understanding of it. Mr. Andrews said but we do it right now. We do a lot of capital projects with general fund versus the capital fund. Mr. Bard stated, we do that because we're saving a lot of money in the general fund on other areas. I'm trying to preserve the capital reserve, so we can have bigger projects that we have to take care of later on. Mr. Andrews said I just don't think we're being honest with the general public. Mr. Karkut added his only concern is he did some research on this and researched a fair amount of school districts. Most

school districts are using the blanket PSBA model, and that's the policy that I propose. I just put the percentages in that most districts use. This does not hamstring the Board to decide whether or not their 3% of an unassigned is 3%, it can go below that. When the State gets your budget and looks at it, they also don't look at one year in a vacuum, they also look at a 5-year window, and they also look at a projection. If for instance Stroudsburg is financially distressed at that point and they look at AFRs more so than they look at budgets as well. They don't necessarily look at the end result. They look at AFR's and look at audits. They don't look at necessarily budgets in that perspective. I think it's more so of where your AFR's, and where your audits are and where your projections are, more so then it is really at the budget level. My recommendation is to use the blanket PSBA policy and the blanket percentages that I recommended in the initial draft. I agree with George, I don't want to confuse you. I want the public to know exactly where the district stands financially, so that there's no hidden trap door somewhere in two to three years from now, where I didn't say where the district stood on different things. Mr. Karkut shared, on the suggestions of what we just discussed, would the committee be willing to entertain using the PSBA sample, which is the next portion of policy book, then we would take the percentages as presented by Peter and then transfer them into the sample. Mr. Forsyth noted I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, that was the exact draft proposed last month. Mr. Karkut stated here's the reason I'm bringing this up, last month I was a little perplexed by it, but now I took some time to look at other districts, I feel comfortable going with this policy as presented by PSBA. I don't know how the rest of you feel and that's the way we presented it last month. But we didn't know about it. It was just like kind of thrown at us. Mr. Forsyth stated he was just offering to save the detail of having to put it all back together if it's easier for Deb just to pull it back from the previous agenda. It's been on your agenda here twice now. We could simply pull it back for your final approval at this meeting next month in the form that it existed on the agenda last month. If that works and you're under no time constraints for that. Mr. Bard said no, it's fine! You could vote on it next month. The monitoring from ESSER is just to prepare us for the Federal audit, so there's no time constraint to put it on the book. Mr. Forsyth shared it's not on tonight's agenda anyway, it wasn't preemptively thought that it would be passed, so it's just on for discussion tonight. Mr. Karkut said let's bring it back next month, the way it was last month.

- Mr. Karkut shared, next is the list of this policies by section and last updated dates. Mr. Forsyth explained all we've done at this point to get us started was go through each section of the policy book and highlight the dates on the policies that have existed for more than 10 years since an apparent revision. It could be that some of them just need to be reviewed. We already have the policies out into the hands of the departments that work with them the most. For example, we have the policies, some of them in the 800 section that are technology policies. The technology department would be looking at those, Mrs. Bauer's office is looking at the enrollment, eligibility issues and attendance is looking at those particular pieces of policy. What we're going to do then, as we gather those recommendations, we're also going to go and look at the PSBA samples for each of them and start bringing those back here. If that's the order you would like this to continue. At the last meeting, I believe the direction was to look at those policies that were older than a decade. This just gives you a visual representation of how many of those policies are older than 10 years. For example, the 600 section Mr. Bard is looking at all the highlighted policies in that section to determine whether or not we need to make any recommendations, and we'll bring each one of them back to you regardless. If it's felt that we have a policy, for example, in the 600s that doesn't require any further changes, it was just a required policy. We can bring that back and say, it aligns to the PSBA sample still. What we'll do on the top of that policy, if you wish, is mark that the policy was reviewed, not revised, and that way at least we have a visual on the front of every policy that they're just not forever forgotten. That's where we are with this, and we'll be able to bring some of them back to you at the next meeting. We adopted the PSBA policy manual

sequence in 2002, so where you see that indicated as a year, those are original policies from PSBA samples that existed when we adopted the policy manual. Mr. Karkut asked for clarification, when going through these policies are we looking to change the format the way most school districts go with Board Docs. Mr. Forsyth stated we're working through that process right now for the storage of policies. We're working closely with Debbie particularly and Patricia because of board minutes, and we're working with them to bring over all of our current formats in pdf, which is important, and as we edit them, they can be converted into the new format and assimilated with the existing policy manual. We don't have to go through right now and reformat every policy, because that would be a monumental task to achieve before we go live. We're taking the existing policies moving them over and that will allow those policies then to be searchable from the Board Docs interface so that we could go in there and look for "fund balance" and it would show us every one of our policies that have the term fund balance in it. Right now, to do that we have to rely on the Superintendent's office. Somebody would have to call Deb and say, could you please go into your documents and search because the way that the website handles those under Moodle, they're not searchable for the public. This will fix that. To answer your question, yes, they will be reformatted but as we go along. Mr. Karkut stated we as a district were pretty far ahead of our time when we put our minutes, agenda and all our policies online. I think that was pre-Board Docs even. Mr. Forsyth stated the last attempt we had was over 15 years ago. We're not looking at implementing the same way we even attempted it then. We're not looking to change anything the Board does no laptops here, etc. That's up to every individual. We're simply looking to provide Board Docs as the front end for our community to be able to receive information about the meetings and the policies.

The committee directed administration to start with the oldest policies first, 2002-2007, and work their way forward from there, oldest ones and 5 years forward. Mr. Forsyth suggested for the sake of the agenda, having a separate section after current business. Just in case you're up against a time constraint like we are here tonight. We've got eight minutes left before your scheduled executive session. If we were running out of time, would you want to just have us keep carrying those over from month to month in a different heading? Mr. Gullstrand said one of the questions he had is you mentioned that certain supervisors would go through certain areas and aspects? The one thing I like is the oldest to newest, but I also think if someone in that department specifically knows that there have been significant changes to policy by PSBA that that should be addressed. I wouldn't want to wait. If we have a policy from 2017 on, say sexual harassment, and you know it's changed significantly with PSBA. I wouldn't want to say, well let's wait until x number of rotations until we get there. Mr. Forsyth added, to your point, we're going to be bringing policies back here again, as a good example Policies 103 and 104 that deal with those subjects because of the Federal law changes that go into effect August 1st. We're not going to hold those for them to get there. That's why I was asking if you would like to separate current business that needs to be done from the others that we don't have any pressing issue other than our good faith desire to go through them, revise them and review PSBA. Mr. Rohner also requested we provide the PSBA PNN Newsletter on any amended policies. Mr. Forsyth stated we will; however, they sometimes, I will say, they're not as quick as we would like them to be because we're trying to get out there ahead of them as well. We wait for them as long as we can, but then again, if we see something that comes out even a month later, we'll have it right back here to you if there's something different in the policy. We already started the search, Deb did we not? I asked for policies 103 and 104 last week, and PSBA is not there yet with them, so we're watching that because the law has been in place for some time with an August 1 implementation date. Ms. Wisotsky noted just so, you know, the day after the board meeting after the policies are approved, I send an email to all ESASD staff stating, these are the policies that were approved last night. If they pertain to your area of expertise, please familiarize yourself with the changes.

Public Participation: Mr. Rohner commented on the new draft for the fund balance that he was personally in favor of the generic version of the PSBA policy. He stated he did research the other four school districts in Monroe County. Their language is all pretty much similar in their two-page policy, and they were using 5 and 8% as their percentages. He will continue to research other school districts that are in our conference but is certainly in favor of the short version of the fund balance policy.

VIII. **ADVISORY RECOMMENDATIONS**

RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE: Motion was made by Debbie Kulick to authorize and direct the administration to post the following item(s) with noted revisions for PUBLIC REVIEW during the month of May and subsequent Board action in June: Policy 006, 006.2, and 202. Policy 620 will be brought back again next month using the PSBA template, inserting the CFO's recommended percentages. Motion was seconded by George Andrews and carried unanimously 4-0.

IX. **ADJOURNMENT:** 5:27 p.m.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE: Motion to adjourn was made by Debbie Kulick. Motion was seconded by Jason Gullstrand and carried unanimously, 4-0.

Next meeting: June 17, 2024, at 4:30 p.m. in the Carl T. Secor Administration Center Board Room

Respectively submitted by,
Debra Wisotsky